



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/882,172	06/14/2001	John Mark Hartel	AUS920010225US1	7996

7590

01/29/2004

Duke W. Yee, Carstens
Yee & Cahoon, LLP
P.O. Box 802334
Dallas, TX 75380

EXAMINER

ARSHAD, UMAR

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 01/29/2004

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/882,172

Applicant(s)

HARTEL ET AL.

Examiner

Umar Arshad

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 38 is objected to because of the following informalities: it is the same as claim 3. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 – 3, 7 – 9, 12 – 15, 19 – 21, 24 – 27, 31 – 33 and 36 – 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zimmerman et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,417,872.

As per claim 1, Zimmerman et al. ("Zimmerman") teaches a method of editing a property, comprising:

identifying one or more abilities of a property editor (see Zimmerman, column 7, line 66 – column 8, line 2; the examiner interprets the type of the property to be edited as an ability of the property editor because it determines the actions the property editor is able to perform);

selecting a graphical user interface based on the one or more abilities of the property editor (see Zimmerman, column 9, lines 7 – 11); and

providing the graphical user interface for use in editing the property (see Zimmerman, column 9, lines 11 – 17).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Zimmerman teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Zimmerman further teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the one or more abilities are identified by one or more methods invoked by the property editor (see Zimmerman, column 7, lines 1 – 7 and column 8, lines 51 – 55; the examiner interprets requesting for a list of predefined values as a method of the property browser and it is inherent that the list of predefined values is displayed in the property sheet page).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Zimmerman teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Zimmerman further teaches the method of claim 2, wherein the one or more methods invoked by the editor include one or more PropertyEditor Interface methods (see Zimmerman, column 9, lines 7 – 9; the examiner interprets calling the MapPropertyToPage method as a PropertyEditor Interface

method).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Zimmerman teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Zimmerman further teaches wherein if the one or more abilities include an ability to edit a property using tags, the graphical user interface include: at least one of a popup choice selection area virtual button and a current selection display field (see Zimmerman, column 6, lines 26 – 32).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, Zimmerman teaches the method of claim 7 (see rejection above). Zimmerman further teaches the method of claim 7, wherein if the popup choice selection area virtual button is selected, a choice selection area popup is presented (see Zimmerman, column 6, lines 26 – 32).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Zimmerman teaches the method of claim 7 (see rejection above). The method of claim 1, wherein if the one or more abilities includes an ability to edit the property using a custom editor interface, the graphical user interface includes a popup custom component area virtual button (see Zimmerman, column 6, line 53 – 64; the examiner interprets the tabs representing property groups to be popup custom component area virtual button because by selecting a tab, a custom property sheet page is displayed).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 9, Zimmerman teaches the method

Art Unit: 2174

of claim 9 (see rejection above). Zimmerman further teaches the method of claim 9, wherein a custom component area is presented in response to selection of the popup custom component area virtual button, and wherein the custom component area includes a custom editor for the property (see Zimmerman, column 6, lines 53 – 64; the examiner interprets a property sheet page as a custom component area including a custom editor for the property because it contains various properties of a specific type of object).

As per claims 13 and 25, they are of similar scope to claim 1 and are rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 (see rejection above).

As per claims 14, 26 and 37, they are of similar scope to claim 2 and are rejected under the same rationale as claim 2 (see rejection above).

As per claims 15, 27 and 38, they are of similar scope to claim 3 and are rejected under the same rationale as claim 3 (see rejection above).

As per claims 19 and 31, they are of similar scope to claim 7 and are rejected under the same rationale as claim 7 (see rejection above).

As per claims 20 and 32, they are of similar scope to claim 8 and are rejected under the same rationale as claim 8 (see rejection above).

As per claims 21 and 33, they are of similar scope to claim 9 and are rejected under the same rationale as claim 9 (see rejection above).

As per claims 24 and 36, they are of similar scope to claim 12 and are rejected under the same rationale as claim 12 (see rejection above).

As per claim 40, which is dependent on claim 1, Zimmerman teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Zimmerman further teaches the method of claim 1, wherein if the one or more methods include a getTags, method, the graphical user interface includes a popup choice selection area virtual button and a current selection display field (see Zimmerman, column 8, lines 55 – 60; the examiner interprets the GetPredefinedStrings method to be a getTags method).

As per claim 41, which is dependent on claim 1, Zimmerman teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Zimmerman further teaches the method of claim 1, wherein if the one or more methods includes at least one of a supportsCustomEditor method and a getCustomEditor method, the graphical user interface includes a popup custom component area virtual button (see Zimmerman, column 9, lines 1 – 17; the examiner interprets the MapPropertyToPage method as a getCustomEditor method).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4 – 6, 10, 11, 16 – 18, 22, 23, 28 – 30, 34, 35, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zimmerman, U.S. Patent No. 6,417,872 in view of Lindhorst et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,337,696.

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Zimmerman teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Zimmerman does not teach the method of claim 1, wherein if the one or more abilities include a text editing ability, the graphical user interface includes a text field entry area. Lindhorst teaches the method wherein if the one or more abilities include a text editing ability, the graphical user interface includes a text field entry area (see Lindhorst, column 18, lines 27 – 31). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Lindhorst with the method of Zimmerman in order to allow the user to edit properties that must be input as strings.

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, Zimmerman and Lindhorst teach

the method of claim 4 (see rejection above). Zimmerman does not teach the method of claim 4, wherein if the one or more abilities include a text editing ability, the graphical user interface further includes an entry error indicator. Lindhorst teaches the method wherein if the one or more abilities include a text editing ability, the graphical user interface further includes an entry error indicator (see Lindhorst, column 18, lines 54 – 57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Lindhorst with the method of Zimmerman in order to ensure that only valid input is received by the property editor.

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 5, Zimmerman and Lindhorst teaches the method of claim 5 (see rejection above). Zimmerman does not teach the method of claim 5, wherein the entry error indicator is only visible when an entry in the text field entry area is invalid. Lindhorst teaches the method of claim 5, wherein the entry error indicator is only visible when an entry in the text field entry area is invalid (see Lindhorst, column 18, lines 51 – 53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Lindhorst with the method of Zimmerman in order to ensure that only valid input is received by the property editor.

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 9, Zimmerman teaches the method of claim 9 (see rejection above). Zimmerman further teaches the method of claim 9, wherein if the one or more abilities includes an ability to edit the property using a

custom editor interface. Zimmerman does not teach wherein the graphical user interface further includes at least one of a text entry field and an entry error indicator. Lindhorst teaches wherein the graphical user interface further includes at least one of a text entry field and an entry error indicator (see Lindhorst, column 18, lines 27 – 31 and Lindhorst, column 18, lines 54 – 57).). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Lindhorst with the method of Zimmerman in order to allow the user to edit properties that must be input as strings and to ensure that only valid input is received by the property editor.

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 10, Zimmerman and Lindhorst teach the method of claim 10 (see rejection above). Zimmerman does not teach the method of claim 10, wherein the entry error indicator is only displayed when an invalid entry is entered in the text field entry area. Lindhorst teaches wherein the entry error indicator is only displayed when an invalid entry is entered in the text field entry area (see Lindhorst, column 18, lines 51 – 53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Lindhorst with the method of Zimmerman in order to ensure that only valid input is received by the property editor.

As per claims 16 and 28, they are of similar scope to claim 4 and are rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 (see rejection above).

As per claims 17 and 29, they are of similar scope to claim 5 and are rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 (see rejection above).

As per claims 18 and 30, they are of similar scope to claim 6 and are rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 (see rejection above).

As per claims 22 and 34, they are of similar scope to claim 10 and are rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 (see rejection above).

As per claims 23 and 35, they are of similar scope to claim 11 and are rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 (see rejection above).

As per claim 39, which is dependent on claim 1, Zimmerman teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Zimmerman teaches the method of claim 1, wherein one or more methods includes at least one of a `getAsText` method and a `setAsText` method (see Zimmerman, column 8, lines 18 – 20; the examiner interprets the `GetDisplayString` method as a `getAsText` method). Zimmerman does not teach wherein if the one or more methods includes at least one of a `getAsText` method and a `setAsText` method, the graphical user interface includes a text field entry area and an entry error indicator. Lindhorst teaches wherein if one or more methods includes receiving a string input, the graphical user interface includes a text field entry area and an entry error indicator (see Lindhorst, column 18, lines 27 – 31 and lines 48 – 57). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Lindhorst with the method of Zimmerman in order to allow the user to edit properties that must be input as strings and to ensure that only valid input is received by the property editor.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Umar Arshad whose telephone number is (703) 305-0329. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

UA


KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100